DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 830 CE 045 872

AUTHOR Porreca, Anthony G.
TITLE The Holmes Group: Graduate Curriculum Revisions for Business Teacher Education.
PUB DATE 6 Dec 86
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Vocational Association (Dallas, TX, December 5-9, 1986). Some pages contain light, broken type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Education; *Business Education Teachers; Core Curriculum; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Holmes Group

ABSTRACT

Materials are provided from a presentation concerning the Holmes Group, a coalition of 39 education deans from leading research universities, and its reform package for teacher education. The specific focus of these materials is creation of a revamped graduate-level education curriculum for business teacher education at the Ohio State University (OSU). A press release on the Holmes Group, a chart of its geographical regions, and a journal article on the Holmes Group are presented. Other contents include a list of generalizations concerning OSU teacher education students and an outline of issues in professional development of teachers. A description of the business teacher education major at OSU displays the 10-course professional business teacher education core curriculum. A listing of 12 business teacher education issues precedes the reference list. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276830

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Saturday, December 6, 1986 1:30 - 3:00 p.m.

Annual Convention

Dallas, Texas

Topic: "The Holmes Group: Graduate Curriculum Revisions for Business Teacher Education"

Speaker: Anthony G. Porreca, Professor and Coordinator
of Business Teacher Education
121 Ramseyer Hall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210-1177

Contents

1. Holmes Group Press Release
2. Holmes Group Geographical Regions
3. Article from The Chronicle of Higher Education
4. Generalizations Concerning OSU Teacher Education Students
5. Issues in Professional Development
6. The Ohio State University Teaching Specialities
7. Business Teacher Education Issues
8. References

CE045822

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Porreca

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1

HOLMES GROUP PRESS RELEASE November 13, 1985

HOLMES GROUP DEANS ADOPT MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

ARLINGTON, VA --The Holmes Group, a coalition of 39 education deans from the nation's leading research universities, has adopted tough membership standards for participation in its educational reform efforts, members of the group's steering committee announced.

The Holmes Group leadership agreed in meetings that it will seek to expand its network in January by inviting the academic leaders at about 120 of the country's major research universities to join the proposed reform effort.

"While our goals and strategies for improving teacher education may be appropriate for teacher training programs in other institutions, they have been designed with the research universities in mind," said Judith E. Lanier, dean of the College of Education at Michigan State University, East Lansing, and chair of the Holmes Group.

Ms. Lanier explained that the aim of the Holmes Group, founded in 1983 by a small group of education deans, was to focus on improving teacher education in universities responsible for generating much of the nation's research and advanced knowledge.

"Unfortunately," she said, "many of those institutions have often given less attention than they should to the preparation and continuing education of teachers. We hope to change that."

The goal of the Holmes Group in its organizational phase has been to outline "action-oriented" reforms for teacher education, Ms. Lanier said. The group has approved a preliminary version of its standards, which calls for rigorous teacher training requiring all prospective teachers to major in an academic subject area and graduate-level study for students who intend to make teaching a career. Teacher education would become a graduate professional program. Under the proposal, institutions choosing to adopt Holmes Group standards would gradually phase out their typical undergraduate programs in education.

Although the Holmes Group's recommendation for improving teacher education will be modified somewhat during the next two months, the deans have agreed that changes in the way teachers are prepared must be accompanied by changes in the occupational structure of the profession. Such changes would provide a true decision-making and participatory role for highly competent teachers and would encourage them to remain in the profession.

The Holmes Group will issue the final draft of its report, "Goals for Educating Teachers as Professionals," in January. At that time, the steering committee will ask those who have participated in the

development of the Holmes Group standards to work with their faculty and other members of the education community to implement the reform effort by 1990.

In addition to the current participants, the steering committee will invite about 80 other institutions to join the group.

In meetings here yesterday, the Holmes Group leadership agreed that membership in the group should be limited. Initially, only one institution for each 25,000 teachers in five geographic regions will be invited. The group also agreed that at least one leading public university in each state should be included. The guidelines include a provision that such institutions with significant minority enrollment will be asked to join.

The overall quality of an institution is another factor the group will consider in making invitations to other institutions. Quality indicators include, but are not limited to, the following:

*Membership in the American Association of Universities (AAU), a group of 56 of the most prestigious public and private research universities in North America.

*Institutions with education faculty who have been identified in reputational studies for the excellence of their research and development in education.

*Institutions which provide advanced graduate study in education.

*Institutions with an established record of major investment in research and development activity.

During the next two months, the education leaders currently participating in the Holmes Group will use the above criteria to decide which other institutions should be invited to join the group. By the end of June, those deciding to join the Holmes Group effort will indicate this intent and their general course of action. The Holmes Group membership committee will announce the Group's charter members in late July.

To maintain Holmes Group membership, institutions will make an annual progress report and participate in the Group's regional and national research and development activities. These activities will include the development of new curricula and examinations for prospective career professional teachers and new collaborative arrangements with elementary and secondary schools that demonstrate the new policies and practices for these teachers.

The Holmes Group, named in honor of the late Henry W. Holmes, dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education from 1920 to 1940 and a leading proponent of efforts to raise the stature and quality of teaching and teacher education, has received financial support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, the Johnson Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Education. It will count on continued foundation support and membership dues.

UNIVERSITIES PARTICIPATING IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF THE HOLMES GROUP CONSORTIUM

University of Arizona
Auburn University

University of California/Berkeley
University of California at Los Angeles
University of California/Santa Barbara
University of Chicago
University of Colorado
Columbia University
University of Connecticut

University of Delaware
Harvard University
University of Houston

University of Illinois-Champaign-Urbana
University of Illinois-Chicago
Indiana University
University of Iowa

University of Massachusetts
Michigan State University
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota

University of North Carolina
North Carolina State University
University of Oklahoma
Ohio State University
University of Oregon

University of South Carolina
Stanford University
SUNY-Albany
SUNY-Buffalo
Syracuse University

Texas A&M University
University of Texas - Austin

University of Utah
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia

Washington University
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOLMES GROUP

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Lanier, Chair
Palmer, V. Chair
Petrie
Murray
Corrigan
Miskel
Anderson

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Griffin, Chair
Fenstermacher, V. Chair

TESTING COMMITTEE

Case, Chair
Cole, V. Chair

R&D COMMITTEE

Koff, Chair
Hawley, V. Chair

Subcommittees
Prof. Dev. Schools
Labor Market Research
Communication & Tech.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Timpane, Chair
Gifford, V. Chair

Draft
9/25/85 JEL

HOLMES GROUP GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS

for

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION

(Standards Implementation Strategy)

(Grouped by Region with Number of States, Participating Institutions and Teachers Indicated*).

SOUTH CENTRAL	#	SOUTHEAST	#	NORTHEAST	#	MIDWEST	#	FAR WEST	#
ARKANSAS	(24,616) 1	ALABAMA	(37,849) 2	CONNECTICUT	(39,610) 2	ILLINOIS	(120,919) 5	ALASKA	(5,949) 1
KANSAS	(28,169) 1	DELAWARE	(6,692) 1	MAINE	(12,196) 1	INDIANA	(56,574) 3	ARIZONA	(27,892) 2
KENTUCKY	(35,509) 2	DIST COLUMBIA	(6,756) 2	MASSACHUSETTS	(71,550) 4	IOWA	(34,303) 2	CALIFORNIA	(196,920) 8
LOUISIANA	(48,157) 2	FLORIDA	(86,651) 4	NEW HAMPSHIRE	(11,228) 1	MICHIGAN	(88,818) 4	COLORADO	(31,461) 2
MISSISSIPPI	(27,462) 1	GEORGIA	(61,519) 3	NEW JERSEY	(88,005) 4	MINNESOTA	(47,712) 2	HAWAII	(9,216) 1
MISSOURI	(55,182) 2	MARYLAND	(45,661) 2	NEW YORK	(188,819) 7	NEBRASKA	(19,739) 1	IDAHO	(10,110) 1
NEW MEXICO	(15,458) 1	NORTH CAROLINA	(59,752) 3	PENNSYLVANIA	(126,926) 5	NORTH DAKOTA	(7,640) 1	MONTANA	(9,801) 1
OKLAHOMA	(35,030) 2	SOUTH CAROLINA	(35,225) 2	RHODE ISLAND	(10,643) 2	OHIO	(110,327) 5	NEVADA	(7,496) 1
TENNESSEE	(45,498) 2	VIRGINIA	(60,679) 3	VERMONT	(6,771) 1	SOUTH DAKOTA	(8,779) 1	OREGON	(24,106) 1
TEXAS	(168,882) 6	WEST VIRGINA	(22,612) 1			WISCONSIN	(55,306) 2	UTAH	(13,292) 1
								WASHINGTON	(37,744) 2
								WYOMING	(6,866) 1
TOTALS									
States	10		10		9		10		12
Institutions	20		23		27		26		22
Teachers	483,963		423,396		555,748		550,117		380,853

*Example: STATE, # OF TEACHERS, # OF INSTITUTIONS

90 Research Institutions Join Teacher-Education Reform Group; 25 Reject Offer

EAST LANSING, MICH.

Ninety of the 126 research institutions invited to become charter members of the Holmes Group have accepted the invitation, organizers of the teacher-education reform group said last week.

"These institutions have committed themselves to major research-and-development initiatives that will result in a new teaching profession by the 1990's," said Judith E. Lanier, chairman of the group and dean of the college of education at Michigan State University.

Twenty-five universities rejected the offer.

Eleven were unable to reach a decision by the November 15 deadline and were granted an extension, Ms. Lanier said.

Last spring a coalition of education deans, led by Ms. Lanier, outlined a plan for overhauling the training of teachers and the schoolteaching profession and invited leading research universities to band together to implement its agenda.

Not Quick and Simple

The reform package, which is detailed in a 97-page report entitled *Tomorrow's Teachers*, calls for prospective teachers to major in a liberal-arts discipline instead of education, for a three-tier approach to licensing teachers that would require "professional" teachers to complete graduate work, for new ways to evaluate prospective teachers, and for closer ties between universities and the schools (*The Chronicle*, April 9).

"It's no quick and simple series of reforms," Ms. Lanier said. "It's really a three-to-five or even 10-year effort in terms of changing our institutions in ways that enable us to do our work better," she said.

Members must pay a $4,000 annual membership fee and agree to support the Holmes agenda for the next five years.

The group will hold its first national meeting in Washington in January. At that meeting it will discuss its proposals with other leaders in teacher education, including the presidents of the nation's two major teachers' unions, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers (A.F.L.-C.I.O.).

Next spring the members will attend regional meetings to exchange ideas about how they plan to institute the Holmes reforms.

The group plans to sponsor one national conference each year that will focus on one of its goals. The topic of the first meeting, which will be held next fall, will be improving the undergraduate liberal-arts curriculum. Subsequent meetings will cover the establishment of "professional-development schools" that will serve as sites for teacher training; the creation of a revamped graduate-level education curriculum; the training of "professional" teachers; and the development of new and better ways to evaluate teachers. The organization will commission research papers on each topic.

The Holmes Group has received a $300,000 grant from the Ford Foundation that it will use to establish a national office at Michigan State University and five regional offices.

Ms. Lanier said the institutions that declined to join the Holmes Group fell into one of three categories: They had little or no tradition of teacher education, were too small to offer graduate education programs, or were strongly committed to keeping an undergraduate major in education, she said.

Response by Institutions

The following list shows the status of the institutions invited to join the Holmes Group.

A check (✓) indicates those that accepted, while an asterisk (*) marks those whose decision is pending. Those without a symbol have declined the invitation. A dagger (†) denotes members whose education deans belong to the Holmes Group executive board.

- ✓ U. of Alabama
- * U. of Alaska
- U. of Arizona
- ✓ Arizona State U.
- ✓ U. of Arkansas at Fayetteville
- ✓ Auburn U.
- ✓ Bank Street College of Education
- ✓ Baylor U.
- ✓ Boston College
- * Boston U.
- Brandeis U.
- Brown U.
- ✓ U. of California at Berkeley†
- ✓ U. of California at Davis
- U. of California at Los Angeles
- U. of California at San Diego
- * U. of California at Santa Barbara
- California Institute of Technology
- Carnegie Mellon U.
- Case Western Reserve U.
- ✓ Catholic U. of America
- ✓ U. of Chicago
- ✓ U. of Cincinnati
- ✓ Clark U.
- Clemson U.
- ✓ U. of Colorado
- ✓ Colorado State U.
- ✓ U. of Connecticut
- Cornell U.
- ✓ U. of Delaware†
- * Duke U.
- ✓ Emory U.
- U. of Florida
- Florida State U.
- ✓ Fordham U.
- U. of Georgia
- ✓ Georgia State U.
- ✓ Harvard U.
- ✓ U. of Hawaii
- ✓ U. of Houston
- ✓ Howard U.
- ✓ U. of Idaho
- ✓ U. of Illinois at Chicago†
- ✓ U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign†
- * Indiana U. at Bloomington
- ✓ U. of Iowa†
- ✓ Iowa State U.
- ✓ Johns Hopkins U.
- ✓ U. of Kansas
- ✓ Kansas State U.
- ✓ Kent State U.
- ✓ U. of Kentucky
- ✓ Lehigh U.
- ✓ Louisiana State U. at Baton Rouge
- ✓ U. of Louisville
- ✓ U. of Maine at Orono
- ✓ U. of Maryland
- ✓ U. of Massachusetts at Amherst
- * Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- U. of Miami
- ✓ U. of Michigan
- ✓ Michigan State U.†
- ✓ U. of Minnesota
- ✓ U. of Mississippi
- * Mississippi State U.
- ✓ U. of Missouri at Columbia
- ✓ U. of Missouri at Kansas City
- * U. of Montana
- ✓ U. of Nebraska at Lincoln
- ✓ U. of Nevada at Reno
- * U. of New Hampshire
- ✓ U. of New Mexico
- ✓ New Mexico State U.
- ✓ New York U.
- U. of North Carolina
- North Carolina State U.
- * U. of North Dakota
- Northwestern U.
- U. of Notre Dame
- ✓ Ohio U.
- ✓ Ohio State U.†
- ✓ U. of Oklahoma
- ✓ Oklahoma State U.
- ✓ U. of Oregon
- Oregon State U.
- * U. of Pennsylvania
- Pennsylvania State U.
- ✓ U. of Pittsburgh
- Princeton U.
- ✓ Purdue U.
- ✓ U. of Rhode Island
- Rice U.
- ✓ U. of Rochester
- ✓ Rutgers U. at New Brunswick
- ✓ U. of South Carolina
- ✓ U. of South Dakota
- ✓ U. of South Florida
- ✓ U. of Southern California
- ✓ Stanford U.
- ✓ State U. of New York at Albany†
- ✓ State U. of New York at Buffalo†
- ✓ Syracuse U.
- ✓ Teachers College of Columbia U.†
- ✓ Temple U.
- ✓ U. of Tennessee
- ✓ Texas A&M U.†
- ✓ Texas Tech U.
- ✓ U. of Texas at Austin
- ✓ Trinity U. (Tex.)
- ✓ Tulane U.
- ✓ U. of Utah†
- Vanderbilt U.
- ✓ U. of Vermont
- ✓ U. of Virginia†
- ✓ Virginia Commonwealth U.
- ✓ Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State U.
- ✓ U. of Washington
- ✓ Washington State U.
- Washington U. (Mo.)
- ✓ Wayne State U.
- ✓ West Virginia U.
- ✓ College of William and Mary
- ✓ U. of Wisconsin at Madison†
- ✓ U. of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
- ✓ U. of Wyoming
- Yale U.

4

GENERALIZATIONS CONCERNING

OSU TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

1. There is an overall high quality of students attending and graduating from the undergraduate teacher education program at The Ohio State University as reflected by standardized tests (ACT, NTE), classroom performance (GPA, course work), classroom teaching performance (observation, recommendations), and subsequent professional performance (follow-up self reports, supervisor ratings).

   a) There is substantial variability of student quality within programs.
   b) There is marked contrast among programs with respect to student quality.

2. Enrollment trends seem to have bottomed out and they are beginning to slowly rise. We can anticipate an increasing surge in enrollment in the next five years, along with a concommitant demand for an increased number of teachers, particularly in selected areas (science, math, foreign language). Currently we have just under 1000 students enrolled in the undergraduate program.

3. Over the past several years, approximately one-third of our graduates went directly into teaching positions, about one-third went into educationally related and part-time positions (e.g., substitute teacher, administrative support, teaching support personnel), and the remaining one-third did not stay in education.

4. Graduates consistently indicate that they feel a need for greater knowledge and skills in the area of classroom management (after they leave the university).

5. A profile of our graduates looks like this:

   Female: 80%
   Causasian: 96%
   Primary age range: 22-26
   Currently employed: 93%
   Satisfied with OSU education: 93%
   Found OSU education useful: 93%
   Spent all four years at OSU: 71%

6. The group reports low levels of understanding of handicapped learners (40%).

7. About 4% of the communities in which our students have field experience are classified as rural, but former students report that about one-third of their teaching positions are located in rural communities.

8. There is substantial variability among the ratings they give to various aspects of their undergraduate program.

9. The students report (75%) have a very positive student teaching experience and that this was one of the most positive aspects of the program.

10. In a small study, our graduates (in selected secondary programs) compare favorably with students in comparable programs in the OSU College of Arts and Science on ACT and GPA (when GPA is calculated only on common courses taken in the College of Arts and Sciences).

11. There is a moderate, positive and statistically significant correlation among the following variables for our graduates: ACT (at entry), GPA and NTE (at exit).

12. Our graduates, as a group, perform substantially above the national average on the NTE.

    a) Professional Knowledge (70% ile)
    b) Communication Skills (72% ile)
    c) Speciality Area Knowledge (73% ile)

13. In the area of elementary education, we have a documented, positive and statistically significant change in performance of students between the freshmen and senior year on:

    a) Teaching performance on measurement by teacher clarity
    b) NTE professional knowledge (22% ile to 52% ile)
    c) NTE subject matter knowledge (17% ile to 53% ile).

5

ISSUES IN THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT*

Antecedents of Reform

A. Recruitment and Selection

1) too few academically talented students recruited to teaching; from the highest quartile of standardized measures, 11%; from the lowest 38% (Lanier, 1984).

2) need for teachers by 1990 is 220,000; available pool will be 160,000 (Sandefur, 1984).

3) many states issue massive numbers of emergency certificates, e.g., Texas in 1980-81 issued 5,698 (Corrigan, 1984).

4) teacher attrition rates are high; 50% of teachers will leave the classroom after 6 years (37% stay from the top 10% verbal measure; 57% stay from the lower quartile). (Schlechty and Vance, 1981).

5) 32 states use entrance or exit competency test; GPA for entrance to teacher education nationally is 2.2 to 2.5 (Sandefur, 1984).

6) teacher tests reflect linguistic and cultural bias (e.g., white pass rate in Florida is 90%; 38% for minorities (Sandefur, 1984).

7) teacher salaries qualify for poverty guidelines; cooks and garbage collectors start at over $22,000 (Corrigan, 1984).

8) 50% of the teachers workforce moonlight (NEA, 1982).

9) teachers are 91% white, 8% black, 1.7% hispanic; most jobs are in majority ethnic, low-income populations; only one in three teacher graduates want multiracial sites (Haberman, 1983).

B. Preservice Education

1) almost all programs exist at the undergraduate level to accommodate accessibility (easy to enter, short, convenient to academic program, easy to complete, inexpensive, compatible with other careers; low-cost and low-prestige (Clark, 1984).

2) teacher education gets 50% of the funding of other undergraduate programs; $927 per pupil to general university $2,363 or public school $1,400 (Peseau and Orr, 1980).

---

*Howey, K., Matthes, W., and Zimpher, N. (1985). Issues and Problems in Professional Development. Chicago: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

3) 6 to 12 secondary semester methods hours beyond student teaching (Clark, 1984).

4) only 1 in 5 programs associated with research and development of teacher education (Howey et al, 1978).

5) programs are largely homogeneous; little planned variation (Howey, 1984).

6) labor intensive and technologically impoverished (Howey, 1984).

7) lack of clarity on fundamental conceptions of teaching (Howey, 1984); programs rarely derived from theory (Ryan, 1980); rarely collaborative (Howey, 1984); rarely drawn on emerging knowledge base and effective teaching in effective schools (Koehler, 1984).

8) programs are largely technical, linear, depersonalized and morally neutral (Green, 1984).

9) programs reflect anticipatory socialization; giving students answers to questions not yet asked (Katz et al, 1981).

10) increased field experiences hold as many negative as positive consequences (Zeichner, 1978).

11) professors employ limited teaching strategies, and little empirical base (Katz and Raths, 1982).

C. Induction

1) new teachers fight chaos and stress of first years using the "practicality ethic" (Joyce and Cliff, 1984).

2) new teachers are held to the same expectations as veteran teachers (Joyce et al., 1981).

3) higher education assumes little responsibility for induction phase (Yarger, 1982).

4) teacher education programs adher to fundamental dogma not adaptive or flexible to school sites (Evertson et al., 1984).

5) on-the-job frustrations of early years create premature departure from the profession (Chapman and Hutcheson, 1982).

Program Questions

A. What is our conception of teaching and how does this conception permeate our on-campus program and the schools in which we place students?

B. Do we acknowledge (or agree on) an emerging knowledge base for teacher education (e.g., in effective teaching, effective schools, classroom function)?

C. Do we have a sense of program which includes sequential, integrated, articulated and developmental course components?

D. How do we integrate general studies and professional studies?

E. What is or should be the purpose and nature of laboratory experiences?

F. Do we model diverse instructional strategies and our knowledge base about teaching in our college classrooms?

F. Do we model diverse instructional strategies and our knowledge base about teaching in our college classrooms?

G. Can we create planned diversity in an integrated inquiry approach to teacher education?

Program Options

Option A

Intensify the undergraduate effort and extend the program into a fifth or post-baccalaureate year.

Rationale: a) efforts reflect needs but need more time for development; b) programs need central conceptualization, articulation, integration and development over time; c) opportunity to integrate general studies with professional education; d) more time to intensify induction; e) availability to students who need the undergraduate option.

Option B

Remove all programs from the undergraduate level and create exclusive post-baccalaureate programs.

Rationale: a) makes a statement that teacher education resembles other professional programs at the graduate level; b) changes the funding formula; c) more closely matches professional interests and research climate; d) allows more selective recruitment of academically able and mature students.

Option C

Create a post-baccalaureate program contingent on a pre-education major.

Rationale: a) achieves political advantages of option B; b) retains integration and serious acknowledgement of the importance of general studies; c) allows developmental socialization of teacher candidates through early field experiences and introductory or foundational education courses; d) allows selectivity; e) resembles other professional approaches.

Option D

Select institutions withdraw from preparation for initial certification at any level and focus on preparation of career teacher leaders in well-defined graduate programs.

Rationale: a) many problems with structure of schooling require close emphasis on schools as workplaces and teachers as leaders; b) require intensive collaborative work with schools; c) allows concentration on the inquiry focus on teaching and schooling; d) creates a select population of versatile and effective teacher leaders across school districts.

N. Zimpher
1-24-86

6

The Ohio State University

Teaching Specialities

a. Vocational Business: Comprehensive

b. Vocational Business: Accounting

c. Vocational Business: Computer Information Science

d. Vocational Business: Management

e. Vocational Business: Office Administration

f. Minors: Bookkeeping and Basic Business,
Stenography-Typewriting/Keyboarding,
Sales, Speech/Communications

A ten-course professional business teacher education core is established. The business teacher education core is articulated with colleges in and outside the university that provide the appropriate technical subject matter of accounting, computer information science, management, and office administration, as well as other subject matter areas to complement the teaching specialities. A description follows, and concludes with the ten-course professional business teacher education core.

Business Teacher Education Major
(Proposed Description for the 1987 College of Education Book 8)
Autumn 1987 Admissions

The business education program offered by the College of Education is designed for students who wish to prepare for the teaching and supervision of business subjects. Students who expect to work directly with business should contact the College of Administrative Science, OSU, 126 Hagerty Hall, 1775 College Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1309.

The area of business teacher education offers certification in all the business education specializations at the secondary level.

Two certification options are available for students enrolled in the business education major: 1) the vocational certificate, which requires one year of gainful employment in business and office occupations of which a portion may be alternative field-based experiences under the supervision of an approved teacher educator in business education; and 2) a non-vocational option, which prepares the student for teaching in courses that do not require the vocational credential.

The professional education program for all business education majors begins in the autumn quarter of the junior year. A common set of experiences for all majors has been developed emphasizing observation and participation in secondary schools in Franklin County.

The senior year of the program includes two professional quarters (student teaching). Both focus on experiences in secondary schools. Student teachers teach in both inner-city and outer-city settings. On-campus seminars examine issues and problems in contemporary education as they relate to these experiences. The two professional quarters are restricted to business education senior students who have completed all professional education courses with a grade of "C" or better.

Admission

Contact Dr. Anthony G. Porreca, 121 Ramseyer Hall, phone 614-292-5181.

Application: Students should apply no later than the third week of the quarter prior to the desired quarter of entry. Applications are available in 110 Arps Hall and should be submitted to 288 Arps Hall.

Beyond the College's 45 hours for admission, business teacher education requires the following:

1. Students currently enrolled at OSU must complete 30 hours of course work distributed over technical subject matter, which includes: accounting, economics, finance, computer science, management, and office administration. Almost all technical business subject matter is available through course offerings in the College of Administrative Science or in the department of Computer and Information Sciences. Required office administration courses, however, such as beginning to

advanced typewriting, office machines, and office practice, are not offered in the College of Administrative Sciences; these courses are offered at Columbus Technical Institute and may be taken there or at an equivalent institution. Course requirements for entry: UVC 100, English 110 or 111, Psych 100, FEEP (Ed-HuSer 271 and 289.01), Accting 211, CIS 100, Econ 200, Math 116.

or,

2. Students holding an approved associates degree in business technologies and a recommendation from the associate degree program's department chairperson may apply for admission as an upper division business education student. Work experience requirement for vocational business certification: Students who seek certification in vocational business education must have verifiable business work experience. For more information about vocational certification, arrange an appointment with a business education faculty member (292-5016).

For further information, write to:

Professor Anthony G. Porreca
Coordinator for Business Teacher Education
College of Education
121 Ramseyer Hall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210-1177

Business Education Undergraduate Curriculum*

EDPL		CR. HRS.
620	Introduction to Business Teacher Education	5 UG
621	Curriculum Development and Evaluation in Business Education	5 UG
622	Business Technology Education I	3 UG
623	Business Technology Education II	3 UG
624	Microcomputer Applications in Business Education	5 UG
625	Teaching and Learning Strategies in Business Information Management Systems	5 UG
626	Teaching and Learning Strategies in Business Economic and Management Education	5 UG
627	Teaching and Learning Strategies in Business Communications Education	5 UG
628	Supervised Teaching Internship	15 UG
629	Advanced Teaching Internship	15 UG

* Curriculum approved and effective Winter, 1987

7

BUSINESS TEACHER EDUCATION ISSUES

Professor A. G. Porreca
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210-1177

1) Do teachers with post-baccalaureate teacher education possess different teaching skills than teachers with pre-baccalaureate teacher education?

2) Are business teacher education graduates arriving at their first jobs equipped with knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes, which the teacher education program supposedly provided? Specifically, what is the relationship between the business teacher education curriculum and the end product?

3) Given the diversity of business subjects, levels of instruction, and learning environments, how should business teachers and business teacher education programs be evaluated?
   a. Specifically, what are the criteria for evaluating business teacher education?
   b. Who are the business teachers we are educating and graduating?
   c. What critical experiences should be made available in a business teacher education program?
   d. What is the nature of business teacher development? That is, is it based on technical business subject matter or based on professional, pedagogical subject matter?

4) Research studies need to be conducted to identify indicators of teacher

effectiveness. Specifically, what relation exists among certain business teacher behaviors and pupil achievement?

5) Should business teacher competency be measured by classroom teacher performance or by student learning outcomes?
   a. What is the correlation between classroom teacher performance and student learning outcomes?
   b. Specifically, what is the relationship between the behavior of teachers and the academic achievement of students?

6) Among business teacher education students, what is the relationship among SATs, GPAs, and professional knowledge and speciality area tests of the National Teachers Examination (NTE)?

7) What business teacher education curricula models provide an articulated process from pre-enrollment through placement?

8) It is assumed that placing business teacher education at the post-baccalaureate level will more closely resemble training for other professionals. Thus, teaching will be more professional.
   a. Do teaching responsibilities resemble the responsibilities of other professionals?
   b. If so, what are business teaching responsibilities that are of a professional nature?

9) To launch a post-baccalaureate business teacher education program,

effective and harmonious relationships must be established with colleges of business administration.

a. Specifically, what factors contribute to differences of opinion among AACSB colleges and business teacher education programs?

b. Would such differences be resolved if business teacher education were to be a post-baccalaureate program?

10) How much arts and science subject matter is appropriate for the teaching of business subjects?

11) Carefully selected public classroom teachers will be given advanced graduate professional education. These "lead" teachers will hold multiple leadership roles. As a result, what is the perceived and actual roles of lead teachers in business education?

12) How can current and future divisions--between those business teacher education programs in and outside of Holmes be productively channeled towards improvements in teacher education?

In summary, there no one way to best prepare business teachers. Alternate approaches will stimulate new areas of research.

8

References
(Reverse chronological order)

(1986) Alexander, L. Chairman's Summary. Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

(1986) Carnegie Forum on Education and Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum.

(1986) Lanier, J. & Little, J.W. Research on Teacher Education. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd Edition), pp. 527-569.

(1985) Berlinner, D. Reform in Teacher Education: The Case for Pedagogy. Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

(1985) Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing: Michigan State.

(1985) Howsam, R.B., Corrigan, D.C. & Denemark, G.W. Educating a Profession (Reprint). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

(1985) National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. A Call for Change in Teacher Education. C. Peter McGrath, Chair. Washington, DC: American Association for Colleges for Teacher Education.

(1984) Clark, David. Better Teachers for the Year 2000: A Proposal for the Structural Reform of Teacher Education. Phi Delta Kappan, October.

(1984) Joyce, B. & Clift, R. The Phoenix Agenda: Essential Reform in Teacher Education. Educational Researcher, April.

(1984) Magisos, J.H. (Ed.). Excellence in Vocational Education: Four Levels, Four Perspectives. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Information Series No. 287, NCRUE.

(1983) Scannel, D.; Corrigan, D.; Denemark, G.; Dieterie, L.; Egbert, R.; and Nielson, R. Educating a Profession: Profile of a Beginning Teacher. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

(1982) Adler, M. The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto. New York: Macmillan.

(1982) Ducharmes, E., and Agne, [illegible]. The Education Professoriate: A Research-Based Perspective. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(6), 30-36.

(1982) National Education Association. Excellence in Our Schools: Teacher Education, an Action Plan. Washington, DC.

(1980) Smith, B.O.; Silverman, S.,; Borg, J.; and Fry, B. A Design for a School of Pedagogy. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

(1975) Cogan, M.L. Current Issues in the Education of Teachers. In K. Ryan Teacher Education (Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education - Part 2)(pp. 204-229). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.